

BUILDING DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION
Minutes of August 21, 2012 Meeting

Jon Morris opened the Building-Development Commission (BDC) meeting at **3:04 p.m. on Tuesday, August 21, 2012.**

Present: Ed Horne, Harry Sherrill, Jon Wood, Rob Belisle, Hal Hester, Jon Morris, Elliot Mann, Bernice Cutler, Zeke Acosta, Travis Haston and Kevin Silva

Absent: John Taylor and Tim West

1. CALL TO ORDER AND EXPLANATION ON BDC CHAIR TRANSITION

Jon Morris called the August BDC meeting to order at 3:04 p.m. Jon told Jim Bartl late last year that he planned to leave the BDC in the summer of 2012. Jon has taken on additional responsibilities with other community organizations that currently have him at capacity. Jon went on to say that his hope was to have someone from Beacon Development take the chair position due to the fact that he values the group and very much values Beacon Partners involvement. Matthew Lucarelli, Construction Manager with Beacon Development has a 10 year background with Bovis Construction. He was very capable of and wanted to chair the BDC; was approved by the County Commission but unfortunately Matt lives in Fort Mill, and one of the prerequisites of being the BDC chair is to reside in Mecklenburg County. Natalie English and Jeff Edge with the Chamber are currently working to find a replacement. Fortunately, Jim very wisely, suggested the letter of resignation be based on finding a suitable replacement. Jon will continue to chair the BDC until that person is found. Jon also stated that he would like to stay involved with the BDC as some of the former members have in the past. Jim suggested and Jon concurred to be on the upcoming Budget Subcommittee.

2. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

The motion by Jonathan Wood seconded by Bernice Cutler to approve the July 17th, 2012 meeting minutes passed unanimously.

3. BDC MEMBER ISSUES AND COMMENTS

TH: Had a question about an email that was distributed on 8.20.12 by Willis Horton referencing re-roofing and gas fired appliance. Is it required for the mechanical or plumbing contractor to pull a permit within the roofing contractor's permit? And is it required for anything over \$5k?

WH: The roofing contractor doesn't pull it for mechanical in this case.

ZA: Do we need to look at this because there are a lot of them in the \$3k-\$4k range do not get permitted and then the mechanical is not being checked and I've found so many of the ones we are doing have an issue with the clearance, do we need to look at changing or lowering the \$5k requirement.

JB: It's not ours to lower; the \$5k is established by the state.

ZA: The way I read that it says removal repair, replacement or alteration of the vent gas appliances doesn't qualify it at all, doesn't say anything about the fact that if the roof is over \$5k it has to be permitted. We are finding that most of the roofers are taking the flashing off to get the paper off and putting new felt paper on and not keeping the same clearance when they reattach the flashing and it shifts.

TH: I didn't know if we could force a necessity of obtaining a re-roofing permit through the roofing contractors. When you see a bald roof and we know it's more than \$5k everyone loses.

JB: Anytime you think someone is working without a permit, call us and we will follow-up on it. If it falls within the criteria, we'll issue a stop work order which we do all the time. We don't have the resources to police this.

TH: Those are the jobs that this most applies to; it's not the big \$300k renovations, they are being scrutinized.

JB: Situations such as this we rely heavily on people referring inquires to us, they report it, we investigate it and if required we issue a stop work order. If your idea is that we would have inspectors out there looking for this actively and that's what they do, we don't have those types of resources. Frankly if we did have those resources they would be thrown in another direction right now. When we get leads, we are happy to be aggressive and go after them.

ZA: You said it was up to the state to change it from \$5k, is this the state building?

JB: It is in the general statutes.

JG: It is actually \$5k for residential. The \$5k does not apply to commercial construction; residential only.

GM: It is in the NC General Statutes pertaining to building it doesn't pertain to the mechanical, a \$2k re-roof job that involves mechanical will still need the mechanical permit.

JB: In the current environment I'm not certain we would have luck lowering it until the industry decided to make a push to do it. There was an effort 2 years ago to lower the licensing limits from \$30k - \$15k and that went nowhere.

TH: What they are saying is that anything gas fired that's being altered regardless of the cost has to be permitted.

EM: Any conventional home that has a flue going through the roof no matter what, the flashing is going to get removed and reinstalled.

JB: If the memo isn't clear we can work to support it with graphics to illustrate what the problem is but the burden is on the contractors to take out the permits just like the burden is on you and if people don't do that and certainly if our inspectors see something that is in their territory and they know it's unusual, they'll stop and go after it; but they are very busy.

TH: I just didn't know if there was a trigger or flag in the application process for the permits or if there was something triggered by the inspectors, whether it be the building inspector obviously you've got to have a final for the re-roof.

ZA: If they pull a permit for the re-roof it is triggered.

TH: But there is not always a gas fired vent.

JB: The best way to get the contractors to know they have to take out a permit, our attempt was to put out a customer notification and send it to the material suppliers that the people have to be aware that they take out a permit and if that happens then the flue issue will be picked up. What's the process if they don't take out a permit; we follow up on any referrals that are given to us and if we see somebody working without it and we recognize they don't have a permit; we'll go after them but are we out there looking for these specifically; no.

KS: Once you receive information that someone out there is working without a permit; how long will it take the department to move?

JB: Next day. Gene, Patrick and I get emails and calls about this stuff with some regularity; not every day but it's not unusual for me to get one of these a week. I simply determine which team it is and turn it over to the team and we send somebody out – it becomes part of the inspection workload for that day. In the scheme of the 1,600 inspections we do a month; it's not a big number but when we get them we move on them and we move quickly.

BC: Is there any repercussions to the homeowners? If something happens and there is a fire and they find out the roof got replaced and there were no permit pulled, is there any reason to publicize that to homeowners, is it something they need to know and would therefore be asking their roofer whether they need a permit?

JB: Ultimately, the homeowner's own the responsibility for their building to be in compliance with the building code, the owners own the responsibility. If they hire a contractor, technically the contractor is working for them. In the end when the contractor is gone the responsibility of burden to comply with the building code falls back on them. Yes there is a repercussion.

BC: That would indicate to me the best way to deal with it is to publicize it to homeowners. Because the contractors already have an idea that they don't want to know what the threshold is. But if a homeowner knows the repercussions...

JB: It is true there are some contractors and suppliers that are concerned about people knowing what they are suppose to do and there are others that run from it. We've always had a problem with supply houses disseminating information for us because their job is to sell stuff, not to scare people away by getting permits. This is a practical problem we have in disseminating information through the supply chains, through the material suppliers because it's not part of what they do and many of them think it gets in the way of moving product.

EM: When did the \$5k requirement go into effect?

JB: It has been in effect as long as I've been here.

Jon Morris thanked Jeff Griffin for his help and quick response to a customer issue which he reiterated this as an example of how the project management system is working.

Hal Hester thanked Rebecca and Bill Spidel on their assistance with Notify Me.

4. PUBLIC ATTENDEE ISSUES

Joe Padilla with REBIC shared that the last week of September they will hold a Builder/Developer round table discussion with Dave Canaan's group, he welcomed anyone from the BDC and from Code Enforcement as well. Jim Bartl asked Joe to send the actual date of the meeting and he will try to attend (one of the three directors will be there).

5. CRWG DETAIL SUBCOMMITTEE RFBA

Patrick Granson gave an update on the BVD (a subject reviewed in the Cost Recovery Work Group). The group reviewed the Building Valuation Data model; it evaluates what the estimated total construction cost would be per square foot based on type of construction of the building and the occupancy classification. 20 projects were studied and showed that the BVD was off due to the ramping down of 2008 in the BVD statement. We came up with some modifiers to adjust certain building types that were being taken advantage of in terms of looking at the square footage cost. We had several discussions with the contractor's about how they came up with the total construction cost. We modified open parking garages (60%) enclosed parking garages were 50%, shell buildings went from 80% to 60% and stayed the shell buildings at 50%. What we want to do is go across the board with new construction, modify those where the construction cost is more realistic to what they are using it for the \$ of the building. BVD members asked to have construction examples; Patrick came up with some very good ones.

EM: How often will this be evaluated?

JB: We decided this is one of the few areas where we will maintain a standing group of contractors to give us input on this once per year. The BVD usually comes out in the winter from ICC; our plan from now on is to get the group back together and go through it discussing what makes sense and what doesn't; once per year.

Jim Bartl discussed the wrap up of the CRWG initiatives briefly summarizing key points included; 2 changes 1 that goes into the Fee Ordinance and another that goes into the Building Development Ordinance again it's the end of an effort that was started over a year ago coming out of the FY12 budget process where the Budget Subcommittee and the BDC asked us to study how to level the valleys where there were discrepancies in the cost of service verses the fees that are generated in those service areas, which brought through an array of changes you approved in March and moved through to the BOCC on June the 5th. There were 2 details left you asked us to work on and one that the work group recommended and the BDC members concurred; 1) upfit renovation permit fee calculator, 2) inspection count limits on mega projects and 3) owner as contractor inspection count limits. We held 4 meetings with that subcommittee in May and June and agreed to defer the mega project inspection count limit but advance changes on the other two. In front of you today is a formal proposal to change the Fee Ordinance and the Building Development Ordinance to get the last of those two changes in place which will complete the CRWG's initiatives. 1) To create an upfit renovation permit fee calculator, recommends taking the renovation alteration calculator that we already have and combine it with upfits to make one that covers all of them. A big thing it does, is raises the ceiling for that calculator from \$50k – \$100k. For projects \$100k or less will use this calculator which charges base permit fees of \$83.80 per trade and square foot charges of .12 for Building .08 on MEP and anything above the \$100k reverts to the normal Fee Ordinance structure. The study that Patrick assembled indicates this will raise the recovery rate; an estimate based on a pool of projects. It will raise the recovery rate from less than 35% to over 50% on this field of projects; nowhere near the 80% we estimated getting on some other projects but the subcommittee felt this was a good middle ground. We will make the change, put it in place, let it run for 2 -3 years and come back to study it again. 2) A recommendation on owner as contractor issue that we focus on residential owner as contractor because those were 98% of the deficit problems that we seem to be running into. We created a tool by lifting something that has been used in

Wilmington for a number of years and has been successful, this would apply for projects less than \$30k construction cost, over \$30k goes back to the basic fee structure but under \$30k means that they will be charged \$60 per trade permit fee (each). If they have to have a plan review it will be \$45 per trade and they are charged the inspections on a per trip basis. \$45 per trip with a 30 minute time limit (45 per trip is whether they are single or multi trade). There is one other change in this fee ordinance that has to do with something we have been working with Marvin on not relating to the subcommittee's work but while we were in the ordinance, we needed to clarify the language of work started without a permit and how the triple fee charge is actually calculated. There is a 12 year president in how we do this but when you look at the language it wasn't clear that the language matched the process so we are aligning that process. In the RFBA we sent to you we said these would be effective as soon as the board approved it; we'll have to revise and make it effective on November 5th as it will take some time to get the technology in place especially for the residential one.

BC: You triple the fee and add 25% on top of that triple fee; correct (25% on top of the triple fee)?

JB: Correct. Good, this means that the way we reworded it is finally clear.

Travis Haston made the motion to support the RFBA dated 9-18-2012 to amend the Fee Ordinance and the Building Development Ordinance with Ed Horne seconding the motion; the motion passed unanimously.

6. STATUS UPDATE ON AE FEEDBACK TOOL PILOT

Patrick Granson shared that the AE Feedback Tool is built into the EPM process. Every time we have a review, the client survey will look at each individual trade; send a survey out to the A/Es to review the process; not dealing with the codes but the process. We've received good responses from the A/E industry. Melanie Sellers shared that we are at a 29% response rate on surveys and out of those we've received 370 surveys (with 8 questions on each survey) with 2100 questions answered. On every question there is an opportunity to list a comment; we've received 149 comments of those 34 comments showing "does not meet" category with the majority of those being about packaging the project ensuring the bookmarks are there which appears to be a learning curve on packaging drawings and one the sheet index; the inability to cut and paste. On the sheet index we are working with the software developer to go ahead and change that so you can copy and paste from excel. On the other comments, most appreciate interactive review and appreciate not having to bring paper to the office. Once they get used to how to package they really like uploading through the system. We also received a lot of comments about our excellent customer service. Jim Bartl shared that this pilot we are running is contracted for 12,000 surveys and we'll be running it for a while. The response rate is very high for surveys; if that continues, it will become a normal part of the EPM maintenance program. We'll have this feedback tool entered into that part of the technology budget and we'll contract these people long term. It's a web based tool so that the triggers are set inside EPM but the surveys go to the design facilitator web site where they collect all the data in which they have access.

BC: It's cool to get 29% feedback when it's not largely negative, usually the only time you see that kind of feedback is when people are angry about something. People don't usually bother unless they want something changed.

JB: The initial numbers on this are unusually high. To have 2,164 question responses and 149 open ended comments and only have 34 on the lower end of the spectrum; that is very good considering the cultural changes we put the A/Es through to move to EPS, we are very happy.

TH: Are all the responses sent through email?

JB: They are all electronic. EPM triggers it on a cycle basis so that when a cycle closes it automatically sends an email to the A or the E of the cycle and asks them for feedback. That report was for a 2 month period that we have been running the pilot. EPM itself now has moved 1,500 projects through, so EPM works.

7. DEPARTMENT STATISTICS AND INITIATIVES REPORT

Statistics Report

Permit Revenue

- July permit (only) revenue- \$1,422,721, compares to June revenue of \$1,528,107.
- Fy13 budget projected monthly permit revenue; \$13,725,566/12 = \$1,143,797
- So July permit revenue is about \$279k or 24% above July projection

Construction Value of Permits Issued

- July total - \$205,530,645, or roughly the same as June, 2012 (\$198M)
- July 2012 at \$205.5M is about 8.2% below July 2011 at \$223.89M

Permits Issued:

	June	July	3 Month Trend
Residential	4340	4170	3529/4231/4340/4170
Commercial	2565	2314	2646/3279/2565/2314
Other (Fire/Zone)	471	455	504/423/471/455
Total	7376	6939	6679/7933/7376/6939

- Residential down 4%; commercial down 9.8%; total down 6%

Inspection Activity: Inspections Performed:

Insp. Req.	June	July	Insp. Perf.	June	July	% Change
Bldg.	4780	4817	Bldg.	4707	4742	+0.07%
Elec.	6286	6688	Elec.	6253	6705	+7.23%
Mech.	3253	3409	Mech.	3270	3395	+3.8%
Plbg.	2523	2348	Plbg.	2504	2357	-5.87%
Total	16,842	17,262	Total	16,734	17,159	+2.54%

- Insp performed; bldg about same; MEP trades up ranging about 4% - to 7%; overall av'g up 2.54%
- Inspections performed were 99.4% of inspections requested

Inspection Activity: Inspections Response Time

Insp. Resp. Time	OnTime %		Total % After 24 Hrs. Late		Total % After 48 Hrs. Late		Average Resp. in Days	
	June	July	June	July	June	July	June	July
Bldg.	91.8	91.9	94.3	93.5	97.7	98.0	1.18	1.18
Elec.	88.9	88.5	91.9	91.0	98.2	98.6	1.21	1.22
Mech.	87.4	88.4	91.2	90.4	96.3	97.1	1.27	1.25
Plbg.	93.4	95.1	94.7	95.8	98.7	99.4	1.14	1.10
Total	90.1	90.3	92.9	92.2	97.8	98.2	1.2	1.2

- Bldg same; Elec down .4%, Mech up 1%, Plbg up 1.7%

- Overall average position same and still at or above 85-90% goal range

Inspection Pass Rates for July, 2012:

OVERALL MONTHLY AV'G @ 84.05%, compared to 85.97%, in June

<u>Bldg:</u>	June – 80.77%	<u>Elec:</u>	June – 83.98%
	July – 77.94%		July – 83.73%

<u>Mech:</u>	June – 89.9%	<u>Plbg:</u>	June – 91.99%
	July – 86.4%		July – 90.89%

- All down; Bldg down 3%, Elec down .25%, Mech down 3.5%, Plbg down 1.1%
- Overall average down 2%, but still well above 75-80% goal range

OnSchedule and CTAC Numbers for July, 2012

CTAC:

- 136 first reviews
 - Projects approval rate (pass/fail) – 58%
 - CTAC was 50.4% of OnSch (*) first review volume ($136/136+134 = 270$) = 50.37%
- *CTAC as a % of OnSch is based on the total of only scheduled and Express projects

OnSchedule:

- July, 11: 175- 1st rev'w projects; on time/early – 92.25% all trades, 93.75% B/E/M/P only
- August, 11: 238- 1st rev'w projects; on time/early – 95% all trades, 94.75% B/E/M/P only
- Sept, 11: 219 - 1st rev'w projects; on time/early – 95.25% all trades, 96.5% B/E/M/P only
- October, 11: 176- 1st rev'w projects; on time/early – 96.75% all trades, 96.25% B/E/M/P only
- November, 11: 184 - 1st rev'w projects; on time/early – 91.75% all trades, 93.25% B/E/M/P only
- December, 11: 143 - 1st rev'w projects; on time/early – 95% all trades, 96% B/E/M/P only
- January, 2012: 136 - 1st rev'w projects; on time/early – 78% all trades, 87% B/E/M/P only
- February, 12: 139 - 1st rev'w projects; on time/early – 74.88% all trades, 73% B/E/M/P only
- March, 12: 127 - 1st rev'w projects; on time/early – 86.25% all trades, 87% B/E/M/P only
- April, 12: 151 - 1st rev'w projects; on time/early – 92.25% all trades, 95% B/E/M/P only
- May, 12: 195 - 1st rev'w projects; on time/early – 94.5% all trades, 97% B/E/M/P only
- June, 12: 235 - 1st rev'w projects; on time/early – 98.63% all trades, 98.25% B/E/M/P only
- July, 12: 166 - 1st rev'w projects; on time/early – 94.88% all trades, 97.5% B/E/M/P only

Booking Lead Times

- OnSchedule Projects: **for reporting chart posted on line**, on July 30, 2012, showed
 - 1-2 hr projects; at 2-5 work days book'g lead, but CMUD-7, Hlth-10, CLT Zon'g at 8 days.
 - 3-4 hr projects; at 3-7 work days lead time, but Hlth-13 and CLT Zon'g at 12 days.
 - 5-8 hr projects as follows;
 - CFD & County Zon'g – 3 works days; MCFM – 5; MEP - 9; Bldg & CMUD – 10
 - City Zon'g – 12; Health – 13 work days
- CTAC plan review turnaround time; BEMP at 4 work days and all others at 2-3 days
- Express Review – booking lead time was; 16 work days for small projects, 16 work days for large

STATUS REPORT ON VARIOUS DEPARTMENT INITIATIVES

July Meeting Follow Up BDC Quarterly Bulletin

We received the comments from BDC Chair and the Department posted and e-mailed the Quarterly Bulletin on August 14.

CSS Report Follow Up Work

Jim Bartl shared that we have done a lot of work on the CSS follow up work. We have a three prong follow up effort. The auto notification effort on August 17th we had 5 industry members and Greg Austin which was a former member of the original CCTF and a former public representative for the BDC. At the first meeting we presented them with how it works now and got their initial thoughts on what might be changed with the tool. Some of the conclusions that we came to originally auto notification was about lead time and today it's about ensuring that the inspector can get in. That is the difference in criteria from what we first designed this. We do have some members on the reconvene that were on the original task force. They suggested providing a subscription template to the contractors so that the contractors can self manage the process so that if they want to assign just one person to be the email contact or can choose to have multiple email contacts (group under one superintendent) that the template be designed that the contractors just manage it. Whatever they put into that template for that project is what is going to happen when the inspector hits the notification button. We talked about the importance to find ways to manage excessive customer calls to inspectors. Jeff and Gary have documented some obscene cases. One contractor called an inspector 24 times in an hour. When the inspector gets a call and he's got to return it, it's time trashed out of the scheduled. We've pointed out what's different for contractors from us is we can't make phone calls while traveling in a vehicle, we have to pull to the side of the road to return their calls. The industry and department agreed that this needs attention. The next meeting is September 12th at 2:00 p.m. and that's when we get the industries first hard feedback on a bunch of ideas that we threw at them. The second thing we have gotten together a group of 4 architects, 4 engineers and 4 general contractors to deal with the setup topics that they can give us feedback to help us understand what customers meant. We've sent 15 invitations to people that actually gave us comments; we've got 3 acceptances from architects, we handed out 6 more invitation letters at the Code Compliance meeting requesting referrals, so we are still working on that. There was another group that we're trying to assemble which are business persons and they are going to focus on this issue of the challenge as we move to a virtual process and how do we move the 80% of the people along without losing the other 20%. We've made some initial contacts to the Dean at UNC Charlotte SOA, he thinks he can plug us into some people at the business school. If you have ideas (names) you want to give us we'll send invitations to them. Jon Morris suggested that we contact Natalie with the Chamber. We're not looking to put together a huge group because this really is more of a "blue-sky" type meeting. We have an idea of how we might manage this problem but our thought is that we are not the first business to go to a completely virtual set up, which is what this is about so there has to have been private sector groups that have gotten there first and if they got there first they must have wrestled with successfully shifting 80% and you can't just ignore the 20% so what do you do with them? But at what point are you handholding so much that something else has to happen. Those are the types of questions that need answers.

Other

RDS Turnaround Time

Tim Taylor shared that as of Monday we were 4 days out on paper, 2 days out on electronic and 1 day out on townhouses. We implemented our gatekeeping functions on July 23rd and it has had some success most of which was on the homeowner side. We have filled 3 of our part-time employee positions. 2 are scheduled to start 8.22 and they will average somewhere between 16 and 20 hours depending on workload. We have one full time vacant position that we still need to concentrate on hiring. That position typically works 75% in residential and 25% in CTAC. We have one of our part-time positions coming from another jurisdiction.

EM: For a long time people have been submitting paper and not doing masters if we have the group of resources that is plentiful, does that make sense to point out to people the ability to turn in masters and they pay a fee, applied towards the future permit but allow people to get ahead on some master plans?

TT: We do have that function; I have not advertised it yet because we have not been in a position to do so until now.

EM: You've got the momentum going it seems like it would make sense to do that now.

JB: We'll have to discuss with Amy Hollingsworth on the business management side of that to ensure we dot the I's and cross the T's.

RB: Do we know how that number dropped down so fast? Is it because the amount of plans dropped off or because you put a great deal of time into it?

TT: We have seen a slight slowdown in the submittals (in addition to busting it).

RB: Do you think it is going to stay where it is or drop further?

EM: Seasonally, you'll normally get the yearend push that happens about this time. You'll see it drop then you'll get the spring starts that will start ramping up the work.

JB: It's a combination of the volume being down and he's throwing a lot of resources at it.

RB: So you went from 85 plans a week down to 18?

TT: Yes

EM: Some of that that we have talked about over the last few months is backlogged and getting through engineering. There are interpretations coming out on wind load changes, etc. and people want to get plans resubmitted, how does that work, how do you do that?

TT: Change in design?

EM: A new interpretation in design that is much more lenient than what they had before.

JB: Those are code changes that are being pushed through that are not all the way through; right?

LMc: We have been waiting on an interpretation from DOI that we haven't received to date, so they can resubmit as a RTAP.

EM: So going from 100% to 60% wind loads, submitted as RTAP?

JB: The big changes he is talking about on bracing that has yet to work its way through?

LMc: There is a meeting next Tuesday for special needs BOCC to address temporary or bracing SFR and there will be another item on the same agenda dealing with duct siding from duct gauges.

EM: So would that mean people who have master plans that had a more stringent wind code on it they'd have to wait until the BOCC September meeting to re-submit or is there a temporary ruling allowing that to happen now?

LMc: Mecklenburg County is allowing that, we've gone ahead and made the rules to accept the full sheathing according to the 30 MPH wind zone in Mecklenburg County, it doesn't affect the rest of the state. Officially the rest of the state doesn't take effect until September.

EM: Good job on getting through this.

Builder Concerns on Temporary Electrical Process

Gene Morton shared that we are continuing working on the request to streamline the temporary utilities or connection of the electrical to include gas connections. We've had 2 meetings (7-24 & 8-7) with several residential builder community volunteers to begin to streamline the process. The attendees agreed to the following conditions that we would automate the process as much as possible and in doing so we would provide 2 streams. The interest seemed to fall in 2 categories; 1) all of the finals were completed and approved but there were still holds keeping the CO from being issued and the automatic connection of utilities and 2) streamlining the electrical part of the building was completed and approved and the way the new electrical code reads, any areas that are approved and compliant can be energized so that we would streamline the process there. For projects with all trades finalized but waiting on holds released related to a local ordinance will provide an automated process and allow temporary power to be connected at no charge. We still need to share and discuss with the City and local towns to make sure that they understand what we are doing and it really doesn't approve anything for occupancy but still get the necessary paperwork to help us with occupying without CO's.

EM: Did you say no charge on that because there are no additional trips that have to be made and everything is in compliance?

GM: Right, performed all our inspections and just a matter of a local ordinance hold being released. There was some discussion that we would probably limit that to 30 days.

JG: We are allowing for 90 days and if after 90 days you haven't closed out your holds permitting the CO then it reverts back to Option 1 receiving an automated charge at that point and an inspection to ensure someone has not occupied the house. Jeff explained his handout is first the automated process currently to get temporary utility and it's been opened up to commercial and residential in the past we haven't been able to do much with the residential end. The biggest thing is the piece of paper that they have got to have multiple people signed and notarized which has to be on the site for the inspector. Inspector initials it, you bring it here and give it to the counter, then it's charged to your account, there is a lot of process of handling paperwork which was the biggest complaint, can we

automate it. We've already got a draft of what this looks like behind the contractor's dashboard where they go in and fill out an online application then it gets submitted and paired with the inspection request and drops in place. The 2nd change is for option 2 which is the homebuilder is saying; they run into an issue with the house where all the technical codes are done but there's a zoning hold or there's some bushes or trees that haven't been planted that is preventing them from getting a CO; can I get power on so I can at least start finishing paint and floor covering, etc. This will allow that. They still go on line and they still complete the application process. Since we're done with our inspections it will be a free temporary utility approval as long as it doesn't hit the 90 day mark.

EM: Makes logical sense and thank you.

TH: What would cause it not to be granted if you had all your trades?

JG: If option 2 it's all done inside, it's just the paperwork. The application process itself says you understand that this is not approval for occupancy, as long as there are holds on the project you don't have an actual CO so there is nothing that would stop you under option 2 when you got to that point but we would have to have that paper.

EM: What's the next step?

JG: I've got a draft together of exactly what we think the wording needs to be for online application process, I am getting ready to send this out to those that participated on the committee tomorrow and let them look at the online draft. The next step will be programming. We do have a temporary bridge in place, there is a way to upload a document online on the contractor's dashboard, and we are looking at that as a temporary fix until this rolls out as far as programming, I don't know what the lead time is on the programming of this.

EM: So when would you anticipate this? Coming into the fall or winter time?

JB: We would have to check with IST to give you a better timeframe. We'll check and let you know.

Manager/CA Added Comments

Gene Morton reminded everyone that we are approaching the DNC and we sent out a blast to all of our customers that they may see temporary delay in getting their inspections particularly those inside the belt loop we could be out 3 – 4 days. Not sure but wanted to let everyone know.

Chuck Walker shared that on the arena, we did an electrical RTAP today and it's coming along well as is the stadium. Our building here is going to be open Tuesday through Friday. We have intentionally not scheduled any preliminaries or express reviews for the 4 days, not knowing what it's going to be like. We know where the roads are going to be blocked. It's our understanding that our parking lot will be open for our customers but there will only be one entrance to each of the lots and a guard on each. Watch posting for road closings, you'll be able to get here; we'll be here and will try to make it as smooth as possible.

Jim Bartl shared that we are doing the user acceptance testing on CTAC-EPS which is the last thing on a completely virtual office, so this is an emphasis for people to do business with us virtually.

Ed Horne thanked Wendell; he had a customer who right at the time we did the work was going to be out of town for ½ the year and Wendell noted the permit as such; very much appreciated.

8. ADJOURNMENT

The August 21st, 2012 Building Development Commission meeting adjourned at 4:25 p.m.

Note: The next BDC Meeting is scheduled for 3:00 p.m., Tuesday, September 18th, 2012.